

### REMARKS

Claims 1-34, 38 and 42 remain pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-34, 38 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Roycroft (U.S. Patent No. 6,855,017) in view of Gere (U.S. Patent No. 5,590,617) and further in view of Tasaki et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,244,425). In his 'Response to Arguments', the Examiner "disagrees" that the claimed ratios, ranges and values that are recited for the jet drive do **not** fall within conventional efforts to enhance and optimize performance result and that the prior art has **not** been able to achieve a jet drive capable of delivering a thrust to intake length ratio greater than 18 kN per meter that is positioned completely within the hull of a watercraft yet offers no prior art in support of such disagreement. The Examiner is, in essence, requiring the applicants to prove a negative – that **no** art exists within the claimed parameters and that **no** jet drive exists that is capable of the described performance. Applicants respectfully submit that it is incumbent upon the Examiner to cite art in support of his position.

In light of the above remarks, applicants continue to believe that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that it be passed to issue. The commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 06-2425.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

/Gunther O. Hanke/  
Gunther O. Hanke, Reg. No. 32,989